DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 688 FL 025 491

AUTHOR	Stenson, Nancy J.; Janus, Louis E.; Mulkern, Ann E.
TITLE	Report of the Less Commonly Taught Languages Summit (Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 20-21, 1996).
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	CARLA-WP-9
PUB DATE	1998-01-00
NOTE	67p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA), University of Minnesota, Appleby Hall 333, 128 Pleasant St., SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455 ($6).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; Conferences; Curriculum Design; Educational Technology; Enrollment Trends; Governance; *Instructional Materials; Language Enrollment; *Language Maintenance; *Language Teachers; Program Design; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Student Characteristics; Student Motivation; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Methods; Trend Analysis; *Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes the proceedings of a conference on less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). An introductory chapter describes the origins and organization of the conference, and notes the sponsoring organizations, languages represented by participants, institutions represented, and professional associations to which participants belonged. Three subsequent chapters summarize the plenary talks and small group discussions of the three conference sessions. Topics include: promoting and protecting the LCTLs (student concerns, teacher concerns, enrollments, institutional cooperation, marketing LCTLs, curricular issues); pedagogy and materials (teacher training and professional development options, teacher cooperation and communication, analysis of a survey of participants, availability of pedagogical materials); and delivery systems (governance, technology). Appended materials include the conference announcement and application, the text of the survey of participants, and a list of participants. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 688

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE CENTER FOR ADVANCED
RESEARCH ON LANGUAGE
ACQUISITION
WORKING PAPER SERIES

REPORT OF THE LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES SUMMIT

SEPTEMBER 20-21, 1996

NANCY J. STENSON, LOUIS E. JANUS, ANN E. MULKERN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL025491

CARLA Working Paper Series #9
January, 1998

CENTER FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH
ON LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
Institute of International Studies and Programs

This publication was made possible by the U.S. Department of Education through Title VI National Language Resource Center funding.
© 1998, The Regents of the University of Minnesota. All Rights Reserved.

Report of the Less Commonly Taught Languages Summit:
September 20–21, 1996

Nancy Stenson, Faculty Coordinator
Louis Janus, Network Coordinator
Ann Mulkern, Research Assistant

lctl@tc.umn.edu
http://carla.acad.umn.edu/lctl/lctl.html

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

January, 1998

CONTENTS

1. ORGANIZATION AND BACKGROUND 1

1.1 The sponsoring organizations at the University of Minnesota 2
1.2 The participants 2

2. SESSION A: PROMOTING AND PROTECTING THE LCTLS 5

2.1 Summary of Professor Gilead Morahg's Plenary Talk 5
2.2 Summary of small group discussions 6
2.2.1 Student concerns 7
2.2.2 Teacher Concerns 7
2.2.3 Programmatic concerns: Enrollments and cooperation among institutions 8
2.2.4 Public relations and marketing the 'product' 10
2.2.5 Curricular issues 11

3. SESSION B: PEDAGOGY AND MATERIALS 13

3.1 Summary of Professor John Means' Plenary Talk 13
3.2 Summary of small group discussions 13
3.2.1 Options for training and development of LCTL teachers 13
3.2.2 Cooperation and communication among LCTL teachers 15
3.3 Summary of Professor Thomas Hinnebusch's Plenary Talk 17
3.3.1 Summary and Analysis of the LCTL Summit Survey 17
3.3.2 Pedagogical materials availability and the UCLA Language Materials 19
3.4 Summary of small group discussions 21

4. SESSION C: DELIVERY SYSTEMS 23

4.1 Summary of Professor Nina Garrett's Plenary Talk 23
4.2 Summary of small group discussions 25
4.2.1 Governance 25
4.2.2 Technology 25

5. FINAL SESSION 29

6. APPENDIX I: SUMMIT ANNOUNCEMENT 33

7. APPENDIX II: SUMMIT APPLICATION 35

8. APPENDIX III: PRE-SUMMIT SURVEY 37

8.1 Is your general impression that enrollments for your language(s) (at your institutions) are increasing, decreasing or remaining about the same? 37
8.1.1 Reasons cited for increases in enrollment: 39
8.1.2 Reasons cited for decreases in enrollment: 39
8.1.3 Self-Study or Independent Study Programs 40
8.1.4 Reasons for increases: 40
8.1.5 Reasons for decreases: 40
8.2 Why do students take courses in your language? 41
8.3 Do you communicate regularly with other teachers in your language? With teachers of other Less Commonly Taught Languages? How? 43
8.4 How are LCTL teachers (at your institution or others you know about) prepared for language teaching? 44
8.5 Did you receive any formal or specialized teacher training for language teaching in general or for teaching your particular language (s)? 47

8.6 Do you know of training for teachers of French, German and Spanish? If so, do you think LCTL teachers could benefit from similar education? 47
8.7 Do you use a textbook? 50
8.8 What kinds of other curricular material do you use on a regular basis? 50
8.9 What kinds of curricular material would you like to use, if they were easily available? 52
8.10 Describe the governance / administrative organization (or structure) in your situation, for example: language and literature courses in one unit; separate language unit; share budget with other LCTLs, more commonly taught languages; area studies; independent study 53
8.11 What kinds of technology help you in your teaching? What other kinds of technology would help you? 54
8.11.1 Technology - Currently Used: 54
8.11.2 Technology - Would Like to Use 54
8.12 Please describe your teaching situation if it involves audiences other than traditional secondary or post-secondary students (e.g., community education, heritage classes, church-related classes, correspondence courses, distance education) 55
8.12.1 Other types of language instruction in which survey participants are involved include: 55
8.12.2 Future plans for other (non-traditional) involvement: 56

9. APPENDIX IV: ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS **57**

1. Organization and background

The LCTL summit meeting of 1996 was organized by the Less Commonly Taught Languages Project, a part of the National Language Resource Center at the University of Minnesota. The impetus for arranging this meeting came from several University sources, including: Larry Witherell, Program Coordinator in the College of Liberal Arts' Institute of International Studies (IIS), David Steele, Director of Grants and Program Development at the University of Minnesota's Institute of International Studies and Programs (ISP) and Karin Larson, Coordinator of CARLA. The original planning meetings focused on a perceived need for more cooperation among the National Resource Centers, National Language Resource Centers, and LCTL teachers within and across languages.

The main organizers of the LCTL summit were Nancy Stenson, Louis Janus and Ann Mulkern. Stenson is an Associate Professor of Linguistics, the faculty coordinator of the LCTL project and an Irish teacher at the University of Minnesota. Janus is the network coordinator of the LCTL project and teaches Norwegian at the University of Minnesota. Mulkern is a doctoral candidate in Linguistics at the University of Minnesota and the LCTL Project Research Assistant. A list of major topics that are of common concern for LCTL teachers was developed and subsequently compacted into three large topic areas, each encompassing a number of smaller issues. Each area became the focus of one of the half-day sessions at the summit. These issues formed the core of the to be discussed at the summit, and were distributed widely among the LCTL community. (See appendix I for a copy of the announcement of topics and sub-questions.)

Based on our budget which was composed solely of contributions from departments and centers at the University of Minnesota, the optimal number of participants was determined to be around 50. Slightly more than 50 people sent in applications, and we were able to accept all who applied. (See appendix II for a copy of the application form.)

In July, a set of twelve questions was sent out to participants. These questions were related to the critical issues we wanted to address. Participants' responses to the questions were tallied and summarized. They were then used as a basis for some of the comments in the plenary talks at the summit, giving an overview of the status of LCTL teaching and learning around the country. (The questions and summaries of participants' responses are listed in Appendix III.)

1.1 The sponsoring organizations at the University of Minnesota

The LCTL project gratefully acknowledges financial support from the following:

Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (with funding from the National Language Resource Center), Center for European Studies, College of Liberal Arts Scholarly Events Fund, Department of Afro-American and African Studies, Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, Department of English, Department of French and Italian, Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Institute of International Studies, Institute of International Studies and Programs, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures.

The Summit was organized in cooperation with the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages.

1.2 The participants

Thirteen of the summit participants represented various languages taught at the University of Minnesota, while forty-nine were from other institutions and centers across the United States. A roster of participants is given in Appendix IV. Participants came from the following institutions:

American Institute for Yemeni Studies, Binghamton University (SUNY), Brigham Young University—Hawai`i Campus, Brown University, Columbia University, Duke University, George Washington University, Indiana University—Bloomington, Indianola High School, Marlboro College, Michigan State University, Minneapolis Public Schools (Anthony Middle School), School for International Training, Temple University, University of Iowa, University of California—Berkeley, University of California—Los Angeles, University of California—San Diego, University of Colorado, University of Georgia, University of Hawai`i—Manoa, University of Kansas, University of Kentucky, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, University of Oregon, University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas at Austin, University of Wisconsin—Madison, and Wesleyan University.

On the application form, potential participants were asked to list the languages they taught or represented. Languages that summit participants either taught or had administrative or supervisory roles over included:

African languages (including from western and southern Africa), American Sign Language, Amharic, Arabic, Austronesian, Bambara, Bantu languages, Cambodian, Croatian/Serbian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Ancient Egyptian, Esperanto, Fulfulde, Greek, Hausa, Hawaiian, Hebrew, Hindi-Urdu, Hungarian, Indo-Aryan languages, Indonesian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Khmer, Kiswahili, Korean, Lao, Latin, Malay, Mandarin, Mande languages, Maori, Micronesian, Ndebele, Norwegian, Pacific Islands languages, Persian, Pidgin/Creole languages of West Africa, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Samoan, Shona, Slavic, major Southeast Asian languages, Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog (Filipino), Thai, Tibetan, Turkish, Twi, Ukrainian, Urdu, Vietnamese, Wolof, Yapese, Yoruba, Yucatec Mayan, and Zulu.

In addition, applicants were asked to list the language teaching organizations they are active in. The range of these organizations shows the width and breadth of activities LCTL teachers are involved in. Many summit participants are officers or board members of these organizations. In fact, many participants founded these organizations. A list of organizations follows:

African Language Teachers Association [ALTA]
American Association for Netherlandic Studies [AANS]
American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies [AAASS]
American Association of Teachers of Arabic [AATA]
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages [AATSEEL]
American Association of University Supervisors and Coordinators of Foreign Language Programs [AAUSC]
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL] OPI Testing and Training
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL]
American Education Research Association [AERA]
Celtic Cultural Center of Madison
Chinese Language Teachers Association [CLTA]
Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium [CALICO]
Consortium for the Teaching of Indonesian [COTI]
Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages [COTSEAL]
Critical Language Association for Secondary Language Teaching Professionals [CLASP]
Educational Testing Service / College Board
Internationale Vereniging voor Neerlandistiek [IVN]
Language Materials Project [LMP at UCLA]
National Association of Asian and Pacific Educators [NAAPE]
National Association of Professors of Hebrew [NAPH]
National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs [NASILP]
National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages [NCOLCTL]
National Council of Secondary Teachers of Japanese [NCSTJ]
National Foreign Language Center [NFLC at The Johns Hopkins University]
National Foreign Language Resource Center [University of Hawai`i]
National Learning Infrastructure Initiative [NLII, part of Educom]
National Resource Center (University of California—San Diego)
New England Regional Association of Language Laboratory Directors [NERALLD]
North American Association of Celtic Language Teachers [NAACLT]
Norwegian Teachers Association of North America [NorTANA]
Persepolis Enterprises
Society of Japanese Language Teaching
South Asian Language Teachers Association [SALTA]
Wisconsin Association of Foreign Language Teachers [WAFLT]

The Summit

This section summarizes the plenary session talks and the ensuing small group discussions for each of the three sessions of the summit. A short summary of the final session appears after session C (section 5).

2. Session A: Promoting and Protecting the LCTLs

2.1 Summary of Professor Gilead Morahg's Plenary Talk

A summary of the introductory remarks by Professor Gilead Morahg follows. Professor Morahg teaches Hebrew in the Department of Hebrew Studies at the University of Wisconsin. The complete version of his talk is available as a Microsoft Word document from <http://carla.acad.umn.edu/lctl/morahg.word>.

One of the most intriguing and instructive findings of the survey that was conducted in preparation for this conference was the fact that considerations of heritage were preeminent motivations for the study of so many of our languages. This finding coincides with one of the great sociological surprises of this postmodern age which has been the survival and legitimization of ethnicity as a major form of social cohesion and communal identity in the United States.

While almost all Hebrew programs benefit from 'heritage students,' many of the programs suffer from attrition after the first two or three semesters. In attempting to discover some of the reasons for this decline, the National Association of Professors of Hebrew undertook a survey of 93 active modern Hebrew programs in American colleges and universities, with a total annual enrollment of about 7,000 students. The survey looked not only at attrition rates, but students' motivation to study Hebrew, a language with a well-defined heritage community. Many (but less than half of the total) enrolled were using Hebrew to fulfill a general language or literature requirement. The fact that over half of the respondents had made an entirely voluntary choice to study Hebrew suggests the existence of a genuine desire to learn the language within a significant segment of the Jewish student population. This leads one to wonder if the attrition in enrollments might be due to the fact that the programs do not satisfy the students' interests. The survey showed that these six motivations to be ranked highest: 'I plan to travel to Israel;' 'I am interested in Israel;' 'I want to be able to talk to Israelis;' 'I am interested in Jewish culture;' 'I am interested in Israeli culture;' and 'I

am interested in Judaism.' The two lowest ranked motivations were: 'It is easy to get a good grade in Hebrew,' and 'Hebrew courses are easy.'

The survey clearly shows that these students regard the study of Hebrew as a means of expanding their abilities to engage the realities of Israeli life, to explore the broad spectrum of Jewish culture and to sustain the vitality of their heritage community in the United States. These academic expectations should be given careful consideration in the planning of even the most elementary Hebrew curriculum.

A cultural approach to language instruction would seek to integrate the acquisition of rudimentary language skills into a broader context of the history of the target language and its profound relationship to the evolution of the culture of which it is a part. There is good reason to believe that an effectively designed culturally oriented curriculum for a less commonly taught language is likely to add significantly to the appeal of a program and thus add to its enrollments at every level of instruction.

The second half of Professor Morahg's talk dealt with NCOLCTL, The National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages, of which Professor Morahg was then the president. The goals of NCOLCTL include raising the awareness of the importance of less commonly taught languages and building a framework for the development of professions which focus on the teaching and learning of these languages. Some of the current seventeen member organizations existed and were active prior to the organization of the Council; others were strengthened by the activities of the Council. Still others, like Korean and Czech, were formed with the assistance of the Council.

CouncilNet, an integrated system of World Wide Web sites serving each of the organizational members of the Council, is being implemented. A hub site serving these field-specific WWW sites will also be developed, and it will be linked to resources outside of the academic LCTL fields. The goals of this network encompass information (news, newsletters, directories, mission statements, statements of common concerns, links to other sites); electronic communication—both synchronous (chatlines) and asynchronous (listservs, bulletin boards) modes; professional development (supporting inservice teacher development) and learning (providing a broad range of learning services, testing and assessment, hot-lines).

2.2 Summary of small group discussions

The following are summaries of the comments from the four small groups that met to continue the discussion initiated by Professor Morahg's talk on enrollments and motivation.

Participants' comments and discussions fell into the broad (and overlapping) categories of a) student concerns, b) teacher concerns, c) programmatic concerns, d) marketing a product vs. delivering language courses, and e) curricular issues.

2.2.1 STUDENT CONCERNS

While it is easy to overlook the primary 'consumers' of LCTL education, the students, many of the issues discussed in the small groups of session A directly (or indirectly) revolved around students' concerns.

A major question raised in the discussion is: "Are we giving students the kinds of information and knowledge they come to our LCTL courses looking for?" For example, while Hebrew is strongly heritage-based, many LCTLs are not (Swahili was a specific example mentioned by one group). Programs could do a better job of meeting students' expectations, for instance, by carrying out studies to find the targeted groups, defining the groups' expectations and deciding if the programs meet their expectations. To combat attrition, we should encourage students to stay with a language in order to study abroad, for which advanced language courses are a requirement.

Since learning about culture has been identified as a key motivating factor for students, many felt that LCTL teachers and program administrators need to ensure that cultural content be integrated into LCTL curricula. Often, however, the predominant methodology either discourages or ignores integrating cultural material into many LCTL classrooms. LCTL programs need to stress the importance of bicultural awareness of differences and similarities between a student's culture and that of the target language. (But see section 2.2.4 "Public relations and marketing the 'product' "for an opposing viewpoint.)

A major factor contributing to students exiting a language sequence after elementary courses is the limited choice in LCTL offerings. When only one section is offered or available, some students who would like to begin or continue a specific LCTL cannot. Additionally, many LCTLs are offered only sporadically, or only for a semester or year, and therefore continuing is not an option. Attrition may have non-academic causes, too.

2.2.2 TEACHER CONCERNS

Most participants at the summit are classroom teachers, and have concerns and ideas about improving teachers' situations. Many of the teachers agreed that cooperation among teachers, both within and across individual languages, is essential. The LCTLs cannot afford to wait until CouncilNet is fully operational, (see the summary of Professor Morahg's talk above), but must begin immediately to communicate and share information. One area in

which LCTL teachers need to cooperate, and sometimes need external support, is the use of technology. LCTL teachers do not have time to create models or materials using newer technologies, nor are such efforts often appreciated by their institutions when they choose to work on this kind of development. It is imperative to find technical support now. National organizations should design tech-based models so that everyone does not have to make the same efforts individually. In addition to computer aided learning programs, there is a need for placement and diagnostic testing materials, as well as curricular cultural materials. Seeking grants to further technological developments for LCTL teachers is a top priority. (See the section in this report on technology 4.2.2.)

LCTL teachers often ask where they can turn for help, given that professional language organizations don't always meet the needs of LCTL teachers. In many instances, the organizations are built on the model of the Modern Language Association, where literary scholarship is the primary focus, and pedagogy is often discounted. To amend this situation, teachers who are members of organizations for LCTLs should urge that discussions of pedagogy begin and continue within their organizations. Additionally, increased communication is needed both within and across professional language organizations. To facilitate cooperation and communication, LCTLs need more forums to share ideas, better access to technology, and larger budgets. Several listservs sponsored by the LCTL project at University of Minnesota are designed to help teachers share ideas, and communicate about all issues, including budgets, methodology, material, and technology. Others can be created for specific language groups on request. Up to this point, however, the existing listservs are underutilized. There is a need for additional centralized clearinghouses where information can be efficiently located. (See discussion below on communicating and cooperating in section 2.2.3.)

Teacher development and training was also mentioned as a primary need and concern of teachers. We need to look at developing a system of inservice training since we can't depend on teachers having training when they come in. (The issue of teacher training was discussed more extensively during Session B, sections 3.1—3.2.)

2.2.3 PROGRAMMATIC CONCERNS: ENROLLMENTS AND COOPERATION AMONG INSTITUTIONS

There was a major discussion concerning enrollments in LCTL courses. The comments were not only about how to avoid downward trends; serious consideration was also given to why we want to maintain or increase enrollment figures. Some noted that if teachers are solely interested in job security, we need to rethink the role of LCTLs in higher education and society in general.

The desire to inform more people about our programs and about the potential benefits of studying and speaking a LCTL led to a discussion on marketing. LCTLs need a national public relations effort, with proactive recruitment and development of new markets. Some suggested strategies include recruiting heritage seniors, using creative scheduling, and linking requirements to other units. Appealing to cultural heritage groups is a valuable resource that is often overlooked. One teacher of Polish, for example, recruited students using a creative marketing strategy: calling all students with Polish last names listed in a campus phone directory. Students who have previously taken a LCTL course are a valuable resource for recruiting—they often have more credibility with other students than do teachers or others in a program.

We can increase the awareness and interest in LCTLs by increasing exposure to LCTL languages and cultures in K-12 education, increasing LCTL-related cultural activities on campus, getting media cooperation and attention, and separating true beginners from students with some exposure to the language. This effort should be aimed at the general public, not only at students with a heritage interest (the chief motivating factor for many LCTLs).

To make our teaching more effective for the greatest number of students, we should consider developing special 'cross-over' courses for students who have mastered one language and want to learn a related one. For example, a student who has studied or knows Russian can profit from a different kind of Polish class than someone who has had no background in a Slavic language. Many pairs, or families, of languages could benefit from this kind of cross-over focus.

Programs need to keep an eye on what's happening beyond the walls of academe. LCTL programs need to inform legislators and people other than deans and administrators about LCTL activities. State-supported institutions need to convince the public (their ultimate source of funds) that the larger society benefits from LCTL teaching and learning. Programs working independently should aim at cooperative ventures, perhaps setting up private funding and endowments for assuring successful maintenance and possible growth.

Since enrollments are somewhat cyclical, the overall national delivery of courses might be well-served by establishing at least one or two institutions ('flagship institutions') which always offer core courses in a particular language, so that the study of that language is not subject to whims of current events and international relations. This would involve sharing and cooperating beyond the traditional walls of specific departments and institutions. Given the state of funding for higher education in general (and LCTLs in particular), the idea of many institutions competing in their offerings is counterproductive. Various consortia (for example the

midwestern Committee for Institutional Cooperation [CIC] or the Council of Teachers of Southeast Asian Languages) already cooperate on intensive summer offerings for LCTLs, and the model ought to be expanded upon.

2.2.4 PUBLIC RELATIONS AND MARKETING THE 'PRODUCT'

How can we change attitudes about studying languages in general and LCTLs in particular? Would it help to do attitude studies and then develop marketing strategies that capitalize on the results? Perhaps we need to have national organizations conducting studies, for example, public relations surveys on why people study a LCTL. Currently, the Slavic Linguistics Task Force is doing such a survey. It was suggested that we could call graduate school marketing departments to discuss a cooperative venture. These departments are often looking for projects of this nature for their students to develop.

A lively discussion took place about whether it makes sense to think in terms of marketing foreign language skills as a product. One participant argued that students are paying a lot of money for the 'product' of education, so we must be market-oriented. What we provide for the students is probably the resource that is most immediately translatable into a marketable skill. On the other hand, another participant noted that many languages, such as Persian, are not marketable—people do not pursue these languages because they represent a valuable 'product' or skill. Taking the marketing approach would cut the ground out from under these languages in terms of attracting higher enrollments. Students have other needs and desires when they choose to study a LCTL. A third participant pointed out that the U.S. government needs foreign language skills for everything from peace-keeping to intelligence to humanitarian efforts. Most of the time native speakers hired from abroad are used for such tasks. If we emphasized the value of language work to legislators, councils, etc., we would have a good marketing strategy (for *all* languages, even Persian!).

Some questioned whether we should be in the business of marketing a product at all—the metaphor is inappropriate because we are teachers of language. If what students want is just to learn about a culture, they should take a culture class, not a language class. We cannot tailor the 'product' to the market; we can't just give students what they want or like, because there may be aspects of the language that they don't like, but that they need in order to use the language proficiently.

From a programmatic viewpoint, deans, provosts and administrators are thinking only of the balance sheet, of profit and loss; if we don't follow their lead, the already bleak funding situation will become even bleaker. LCTL teachers need to come up with convincing reasons to enroll in LCTL courses. Since LCTL courses generally have smaller class sizes than MCTLs,

one marketing idea suggested was to tell prospective students that one benefit of studying a LCTL is more personal attention, classes and departments. This factor, and a sense that studying a LCTL is slightly atypical or exceptional might entice some students to try a LCTL class. If we could stress the quality of teaching in LCTL classes, we would have one more selling point.

A broader perspective to attract both students and administrative attention is internationalism, an idea that has caught on in most institutions of higher learning. Thus, we need to make it known that it is not just MCTLs but LCTLs that are an important part of internationalization.

Marketing doesn't have to necessarily take place outside of the university; one's program can be promoted through other classes, by inviting teachers from other classes to talk to your class. We must not forget that potential students can come from many sources. At one participant's university, the Language Center makes it possible to offer short courses and non-credit courses which meet the needs of business students and others and thus create more interest. LCTL programs interested in expanding their enrollments should also consider how to attract non-traditional students. People who are former members of the military or the Peace Corps are highly motivated. We also need to look towards other kinds of learners, hold evening courses and summer institutes, and then carefully articulate them with the traditional curriculum, so that they feed and support each other. We should not lower our standards, but we need to change to fit the times. In sum, we need to listen to students not just for the purpose of marketing the language to them, but to learn from them about how to make a better course.

2.2.5 CURRICULAR ISSUES

How we actually organize our course offerings, what our curricular goals are, and how we can achieve those goals are all important considerations. None has an easy, pat answer. Some of the suggestions and concerns of the participants about these issues are summarized here.

The traditional model of language study is predicated on students taking two years of a language, and then moving into literature. That model does not work for LCTLs, where students frequently need more than two years to develop comparable proficiency. Moreover, literature study is not always the end goal of LCTL students. Course goals need to be clarified and publicized. Are we giving students a language skill, or are we teaching them about the language? Often students are interested in cultural matters, but there is limited time in a semester. Some participants felt that spending too much time directly on culture could interfere with giving an adequate and usable knowledge of the language. LCTL teachers and programs must address the goals of general education and how studying a LCTL can enhance those

goals. This may mean a total rethinking of the LCTL curriculum, which would be best served by intra- and inter institutional cooperation.

We need to look at different modes of delivering language instruction. Looking just at enrollments may be the wrong approach. The concept of American liberal arts education is based on giving a broad foundation to a large number of students who won't go on to specialize in the subject, for example, introduction to anthropology, philosophy, or psychology. However, a first year language course is not self-contained; it is designed to let students go on to second year and beyond. Some participants wondered if we should try to change the curriculum to give a self-contained introductory language course which would provide enough of a foundation to continue, and would also create cultural context. This kind of approach would incorporate language skills into a broader framework.

In hand with the overarching issues of curricular design (and how the LCTL offerings fit in with the larger institution), we need to determine who is doing the 'delivering' of the 'product'? Most of the participants at the summit teach upper-level courses, and we need to ask if the lower-level instructors are doing a good, competent job. Do we have close contact with such teachers? How can we ensure top-quality teaching at all levels for LCTLs? (This issue, of course, is closely related to the issues of teacher development, discussed in Session B sections 3.1—3.2.)

Students of LCTLs have varied backgrounds and interests so it is difficult to focus simultaneously on the needs and abilities of every individual student. One solution that has been tried is to organize the class periods so that on some days the class focuses only on speaking, some days on reading and writing. Students then attend the days according to what they need.

We need flexibility, not only in bringing information to varied groups of students, but also in the organization and design of LCTL courses. Our students and potential students represent varied needs and wants. If we don't change, we will lose the opportunity to teach these diverse groups.

3. Session B: Pedagogy and Materials

3.1 Summary of Professor John Means' Plenary Talk

A plenary talk on issues of teacher training and development was given by Professor John Means, of Temple University and Director, National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs.

Professor Means outlined the areas in which teacher training could be effectively instituted for LCTL instructors. The complete results from the pre-summit questionnaire are included in the Appendix III of this report. While there are pockets of training for LCTL teachers available throughout the United States, most of the participants' responses to the survey indicate that they did not know of any special training or preparation for LCTL teachers at their institution or elsewhere. There are, however, several exceptional programs for training K-12 teachers in specific languages, for example, Chinese and Japanese. When asked about their own training and preparation to be an instructor of a LCTL, participants mostly reported informal experiences like linguistics courses, TA orientations, or mentoring and supervision relationships. Some had attended workshops at teacher conferences, either for general training in language teaching or, more rarely, aimed at teaching their particular language. While most participants did not personally know of training opportunities for non-LCTL teachers either, they saw a real advantage to sharing similar kinds of training. Native speakers need training in language pedagogy, even if their control of the language is perfect. Summer institutes would be helpful, as would good university courses that offer an overview of teaching methodologies and second language acquisition theory. This kind of teacher development would benefit teachers of all languages. An advantage to language-specific training is that groups of teachers would build community rapport, which could lead to eventual sharing of ideas and materials.

3.2 Summary of small group discussions

The small group discussion which followed Professor Means' talk covered a wide range of topics dealing with LCTL teacher training and development.

3.2.1 Options for training and development of LCTL teachers

Training goes way beyond knowing what to do in front of a class of students; it involves the totality of teaching in a program. While most post-secondary instructors take the professional aspect of their positions as a given, LCTL teachers, many of whom are part-time, non-tenured, or non-tenurable faculty, need to focus on how to become (and be accepted as) more profes-

sional. Professionalization is a multi-layered construct and crucial to our performance as LCTL teachers. It takes a very long time to become professional language teachers, and thus we cannot limit ourselves to the current short-term training. To encourage long-term professional development, LCTLs need to train master teachers and learn from other disciplines. Short-term training can be enhanced through summer institutes, and in-service and pre-service learning opportunities. The current, traditional short-term training programs, although they are important and should be continued, are nevertheless not sufficient. Professional organizations are also key to teacher development issues. The *least* commonly taught of the LCTLs need to be brought into the fold and probably need even more support. We need to create links outside of our fields as well. In addition, LCTL programs need a research base for teacher training. It is essential that we enhance our visibility, so LCTL teachers have to be good public relations representatives for what we do.

The scholarly viability of our professional activities is crucial to our work and progress. Empowerment is one issue that repeatedly was brought to the discussion. Participants wondered whether what we want to do is compatible with the current systems of promotions and rewards which surround us. Is what we do always working against the system, or can we change the system to include our work? "We don't understand why you are wasting your sabbatical writing a language text," is a frequent comment heard by foreign language teachers interested in pedagogy. Low motivation on the part of the instructors leads to little action on materials development and sharing. Often TAs and teachers are hired only when the enrollment is established, so there is no job security, either. Interdisciplinary focus and working to change the public's perception of and attitude toward LCTLs will also encourage scholarly visibility and result in increased professionalism. LCTL programs need to work against the attitude that pulling in research money is the only activity that counts in a department. Being an excellent teacher needs to count too.

Teacher training should be taken in a broad sense, not just with regard to the skills necessary to conduct a class. For example, rather than teacher-centered classrooms, there is a need to refocus on learner preparations for learner-managed learning. In order to help our students, we need more research and better dissemination of the findings. Many participants felt that they were not making use of research on how learners acquire language. Contrary to popular misconceptions (based in part on the more commonly taught languages model), two years of college language courses will not make a proficient language user. We need to prepare our students to be lifelong learners.

A question arose concerning the relationship between LCTLs and MCTLs, vis-à-vis teacher development. That each group (the teachers of LCTLs and of MCTLs) can learn from the other is beyond doubt. It is possible to build on training methods across language groups, especially in institu-

tions with highly developed teacher preparation programs already in place. Cross-language communication and training is beneficial and it should be possible to borrow training methods. The idea of developing a sense of community *within* each language is important, however, and should not be overlooked by those who plan training sessions. Continued contact (for example through professional teachers' organizations, newsletters, and listservs) could build on existing relationships and build group spirit. The national teachers' organizations need to help determine national standards or recommendations for teacher training.

One potential problem, which is caused by lack of professional regard for LCTL teachers, is a high rate of turnover. Administrative units might be averse to spending a lot of money to train teachers who might not remain teachers for a long period. Thus the cycle of underprepared teachers and high turnover is perpetuated.

Given the often meager and scattered resources available, innovative approaches to LCTL teaching need to be considered. A suggested approach for increasing exposure to authentic material for our students is to integrate native speakers from the community (either immigrants or heritage speakers). The importance of establishing a close and cooperative working relation with local native speakers cannot be overemphasized. These speakers can create good training, learning and development opportunities for both LCTL teachers and students. Team teaching, in order to encourage sharing of ideas and expertise, was suggested as a model for expanding teacher development among TAs, instructors, department coordinators, and professors.

3.2.2 COOPERATION AND COMMUNICATION AMONG LCTL TEACHERS

Cooperation among LCTL teachers could solve some, if not many, of the problems limiting LCTL teachers. Communication and cooperation across language lines within one institution (for example, Portuguese teachers sharing ideas with Hindi teachers), across institutions (for example, two large universities in neighboring states or cities holding pedagogical mini-sessions), and intra-language (workshops sponsored by specific language teachers' organizations) are several of the more obvious methods of working together. Such sharing and cooperative development, coupled with efficient ways to disseminate the materials, would advance LCTL teachers' efforts.

A possible solution to the limited funds available for LCTL teacher training is to ask for a more active role from the National Foreign Language Resource Centers. It was noted that that the NFLRCs have been doing many things, but perhaps haven't sufficiently disseminated the information about their activities. There is apparently no center focusing on basic pedagogical training for LCTLs, although there is a good possibility that the NLRC at the University of Minnesota will undertake to arrange summer institute on

LCTL teacher development. One other domain in which NFLRCs can help is in the area of research. If LCTLs were able to zero in on types of research we need, that *all* centers could draw from for their projects, our needs could be more directly met. It is clear that LCTL programs do not *only* need language- or geographic-specific support, but general LCTL advocacy and development.

Several specific suggestions for seeking funding and for project proposals came forth, including:

- Language Resource Centers could provide research which would help teachers show the administration *why* teaching and teacher development is important.
- It would be helpful to develop and share a series of videos by master teachers on how to teach less commonly taught languages. Currently, there are a number of scattered resources, but cooperation and information sharing would help us determine what is available and what is needed.
- Having a list of current funding opportunities and resources would be beneficial. Individual projects as well as larger scale undertakings could make use of such a listing.

The following potential funding sources were assembled from suggestions made during the session:

American Council on Education; national language organizations; Longview Foundation; Dodge foundation (K-12); regional (2-3 state) resources (workshops, etc.); area studies centers on campuses can also help for more local training and workshops, and the National Endowment for the Humanities might entertain proposals that have a mix of history and sociology with language content. The Center for International Education in the US Department of Education sponsors research and materials development; FIPSE has funded the development of LCTL material at private and small colleges, and the Consortium for Language Teaching and Learning (limited to Ivy League, but if there is collaboration with an Ivy-league person, those proposals are entertained too).

3.3 Summary of Professor Thomas Hinnebusch's Plenary Talk

The Materials for Less Commonly Taught Languages portion of Session B was introduced by Professor Thomas J. Hinnebusch, from the Department of Linguistics and the Language Materials Project, at the University of California, Los Angeles. The complete talk is available as a Microsoft Word document from <http://carla.acad.umn.edu/lctl/hinnebusch.word>. Below is a summary of the major points in the talk. Much of Professor Hinnebusch's talk served to organize and analyze the responses to the pre-conference questionnaire that participants submitted. In addition, he presented an analysis of various types of LCTL teaching materials that are listed in the database of the Language Materials Project <http://www.lmp.ucla.edu/>.

3.3.1 Summary and Analysis of the LCTL Summit Survey

3.3.1.1 Textbook Availability, suitability and integration

With few exceptions, all respondents to the pre-summit questionnaire teach their language with the use of a textbook for at least the first year course. The few exceptions are Zulu, Micronesian, and one respondent who teaches Japanese. For intermediate and advanced levels, there are fewer materials available. The target audience for most of the available texts is English speakers, mainly North Americans.

Suitability and integration are difficult to ascertain. From discussions with colleagues over the years in the African languages field, it seems that, while most available materials are suitable with respect to teaching basic structures—the grammar of the language—they do not always reflect recent thinking in language teaching methodology (e.g., competency/ performance teaching) nor are they adequate in imparting crucial cultural information.

A substantial number of us report that we make use of video in teaching LCTLs. The assumption is that most use such material outside of the classroom, ancillary to main classroom activities. It would appear that most us have no problem in finding video materials and one would thus conclude that availability of materials is not an issue. However, since the questionnaire did not identify respondents by language for this question, we don't know the situation for specific languages.

An average of 27% make use of realia (for purposes of calculation realia include audio tapes; authentic broadcasts or print material from newspapers, magazines, etc.; maps; menus; visa forms; phone books; tickets; programs/schedules; literature including children's books, poetry, prose and folk tales; photographs; slides; pictures; transparencies; songs and music). The small percentage suggests either that there is a paucity of such materials or we

as a community are not doing the kind of teaching that makes use of realia or have not yet integrated such approaches in our teaching strategy. The use of such materials is usually associated with competency-oriented teaching. Are we doing this kind of teaching? There are other explanations which might be discussed during the focus sessions.

Only 13% of us make use of video in an integrated instructional package. Even fewer (11%) are using audio tapes in an integrated instructional package. This may or may not be a bad thing depending on one's point of view about the use of audio teaching labs and the use of audio materials in such contexts. If we are talking about "mim-mem" teaching, this is a methodological issue, and attitudes about this will vary greatly. But if we are talking about competency-oriented teaching, then this is another matter. Mim/mem materials are commonly available. Integrated competency materials are not common for either LCTLs or commonly taught languages.

The same percentage (11%) make use of CD-ROM and computer software while slightly more (18%) make use of the World Wide Web. Finally, workbooks seem to be not generally available or if they are available, they are not utilized.

These results raise many interesting questions: What does this tell us about what we are doing in the classroom? Does use of these types of curricular material reflect a sophistication in the level of teaching strategy and methodology? What does this tell us about availability? Is there a problem in obtaining other curricular material? And what of the integration issue? Integration here is defined as how well these materials are functionally used in the classroom, and how well they are integrated with the main text or manual. Are they simply adjunct materials or do they play an important role in our teaching mission?

3.3.1.2 The wish list for material

There is not much consensus on how our wish-list should look in terms of a single item. If we had been asked to name one single thing we want in materials, the list might have looked a bit different. However, we can detect some trends: In several categories there is a call for integrated materials and texts using video (24% for video) or the computer: at least 58% call for materials that potentially involve the use of the computer.

The other items on the wish list are teaching aids as opposed to integrated packages of materials (e.g., basic student manuals with videos or a CAI instructional component). It is not clear what respondents have in mind specifically for the Internet.

Most apparently believe that realia properly speaking—SCOLA transmissions, authentic recordings, Internet discussions and e-mail exchanges in the target language—is important, but problematic. It may be that we have plenty of realia-type material or we find certain resources too cumbersome to integrate items into our curricular structure and don't make use of them.

One crucially important class of items did not appear in the responses, for whatever reason, and that was materials templates, authoring systems, and models, especially in the CAI area. I know, however, that this is an important issue for some in the audience and that there are projects in progress involving the development of such models, viz. African languages.

3.3.2 PEDAGOGICAL MATERIALS AVAILABILITY AND THE UCLA LANGUAGE MATERIALS

This section of Professor Hinnebusch's talk dealt with the database on LCTL materials.

The UCLA Language Materials Project <http://www.lmp.ucla.edu/> maintains a database of pedagogical materials for a selection of forty least commonly taught languages. It presently contains citations for approximately 3,800 items which include dictionaries, general texts and teaching manuals, grammars, phrase books, readers, and reference materials. It is assumed that the database is comprehensive and current up to August, 1996. Users can search the database for user-specified kinds of material for a particular language, e.g., grammars, general texts, or for all such materials. They can further define their searches and single out material for beginning or intermediate/tertiary levels of instruction, or material that incorporates technological components (audio, video, and CAI), or could be used in a self-instructional mode. The database is also a research tool that can provide data on the kinds of materials that are available for particular languages and can provide statistical information for planning the allocation of resources for new materials development.

The LMP database also incorporates information from the database of the Center for Applied Linguistics, and includes items for all the languages represented by Summit participants, but because the information is not current, it has not been used in the statistical analysis. It could also be used for other research purposes, e.g., the nature of the material: its type (dictionary, general text, grammar, phrasebook, etc.), and intended audience (elementary, intermediate, etc.). Also one can get some sense of the kind of material actually available. For instance, for most of the languages of the former Soviet

Union (Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Tajik, etc.) the materials available are in Russian and of limited usefulness.

Instructional materials with audio, usually cassettes that provide pronunciation practice or pattern drill practice and similar exercises, nearly all of which are intended to be used in an audio lab, are available for most but not all of the forty languages. Some of the languages, such as Mandarin, Persian, and Vietnamese, are quite rich and have upwards of ten items each that include an audio component. For fifteen of the languages such as Zulu, Kazakh, and Macedonian, there are fewer than three items each with audio components. There are some mid-range languages like Armenian, Khmer, Haitian Creole and Tamil, with four to seven items that include an audio component. The fact that audio components continue to be packaged with teaching materials probably reflects the minimal investment of time, money, and equipment needed to produce such components. Availability of material and its continual production say nothing of quality, of course. Nor does production necessarily reflect current thinking or debate about the value of such material, nor how it might be integrated into current teaching modalities.

Only nine languages in the LMP database have video or computer instructional components, and for most of these only one item is available. Of these, seven have CAI components with the rest having only video. These materials have just begun to make an appearance recently, some of them being produced and published in universities, some by commercial organizations. The general lack of material that takes advantage of newer technologies probably reflects the much larger investment of time, money, equipment, and expertise required. For such materials, it may or may not have anything to do with the question of the desirability or suitability of new technologies in the language teaching arena. Nevertheless, on the assumptions that such materials will play an ever more effective role in proficiency/competency-oriented teaching and that their value will be confirmed, a great deal remains to be done, especially in the area of resource development (i.e., the knowledge necessary to exploit the technology in a language teaching environment), not to mention the development of materials themselves.

As for the quality and suitability of materials for LCTLs, this is a matter better left to searches for individual items in the LMP database and an examination of the abstracts detailing characteristics of these items. For example, the Mandarin item that is listed as having a CAI component is a multi-lingual dictionary that probably will have limited usefulness in a classroom setting, whereas the abstracts for the three items with a video component show much promise for an instructional program.

3.4 Summary of small group discussions

Small group discussions yielded the following issues and concerns related to Professor Hinnebusch's talk.

One group predicated its discussion on the assumption that the materials are not entirely good, but have been improving. Several participants argued that our lack of materials can be blamed on a lack of strong institutional support for materials development. Individual sacrifice doesn't make up for institutional support. This whole issue of professionalism and institutional responsiveness to LCTL (and general language pedagogy) issues came up repeatedly at the summit. The same issues of empowerment and professionalism were also discussed in regard to teacher training (see sections 3.1—3.2).

A question was asked regarding how we can make contact with publishing companies to get materials published, especially for less commonly taught languages. One suggestion was that it would be advantageous to talk to our colleagues in the MCTLs and ESL about publishing ideas and possibilities. These colleagues might have more experience in contacting and convincing publishers to issue more LCTL material.

A number of questions need to be addressed to increase the ease and effectiveness of materials use. How can we judge the effectiveness of materials, especially high-tech? Is what we're coming up with effective, or are we merely using the latest technology as a gimmick because it is a novelty item? It would be helpful to design and carry out studies which investigate the effectiveness of various forms of technological enhancements.

Many participants feel that it is imperative for LCTL teachers to share information and resources. Listservs, newsletters, and meetings of professional organizations all should facilitate the dissemination of this kind of information. Not only 'in-house' or locally developed resources need to be shared more widely, but teachers should share evaluative information on commercial products. Cooperation among LCTL teachers would be improved if teachers could establish clearinghouses for sharing material and information, for example, bibliographies of specific types of material. Given the severe limitations on LCTL teachers' time and available training, having a basic template and document that is not based on a specific language but can be used by all is desirable. Resources from ESL and other departments could be used to develop this kind of template information. However, sharing is not universally looked upon as something desirable. For one reason or another, there is often reluctance on the part of teachers to share material. Ensuring that the person who created the material gets credit (both personal and academic) might encourage more sharing.

If technology is going to play a large role in providing material, it needs to be noted that not everyone has the expertise to use it and use it quickly. Therefore we need people who will help us with technology. The national organizations are logical resources for technological help as are MCTL teachers and the ESL community. To secure video materials and cable we should turn to local community populations to pressure cable companies to broadcast materials, or work with the target language country. The Internet is a relatively new resource for LCTL teachers, with varied and often authentic material readily available. Teachers need to work cooperatively and in conjunction with their national organizations to develop effective and pedagogically sound uses of these Internet resources.

The lack of quality materials may be remedied by requesting that the National Foreign Language Resource Centers [NFLRCs] continue to fund development of more basic language materials, not just high-tech, extensive projects. For example, the University of Hawai'i Press publishes materials developed by the National Foreign Language Resource Center in Hawai'i that would otherwise be hard to get. LCTLs that have benefited from materials development at various NFLRCs include: Amharic, Arabic, Bulgarian, Cameroon Pidgin, Cantonese, Celtic languages, Czech, Dutch, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Japanese, Kiswahili, Korean, Mandarin, Nordic languages, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Quechua, Russian, Samoan, Serbian/Croatian, Slovak, Tagalog, Turkish, Ukrainian, and Yoruba.

4. Session C: Delivery systems

4.1 Summary of Professor Nina Garrett's Plenary Talk

The third session, Delivery systems, was designed to address a broad and somewhat disparate set of concerns of LCTL teachers and programs – how LCTL programs fit into the larger scheme of academic institutions and how LCTL programs can make use of current technology. The last part of the discussion was centered around the diversity of potential students and the diverse settings in which LCTL programs teach them. Nina Garrett, Director of the CTW Mellon Project and National Advisor to the LCTL Project, delivered a talk on the variety of organizational structures into which LCTL programs fit and on technology use for less commonly taught languages.

In general, programs which offer LCTLs fit into one of the following organizational structures:

- Genetically related languages are housed in same unit, mixing LCTLs and MCTLs. An example of this is the Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch at the University of Minnesota.

- Departments are organized by regions; area studies including language; literature; and other humanistic or social studies curricula.

- Separate centers handle all foreign language teaching. The University of Pennsylvania's Penn Language Center is an example of this type.

- In many cases, language courses are included in broader departments, for example Hebrew, Greek or Arabic in religion departments. (Hebrew at St. Olaf College is taught in the religion department.) Anthropology and history departments also often house languages. (Lakota-Sioux at Indiana University is in the anthropology department.) The Irish course at the University of Minnesota is housed in the English Department. Comparative Literature is another department which may host language programs.

Given the variety of available models, there can be no general recommendation for the optimal organizational structure. Deans and administrations need to be reminded, however, that efficient budgets do not necessarily make for effective language programs. One thing that is generally known is that course offerings for Less Commonly Taught Languages is sporadic in many institutions, probably more sporadic than for MCTLs. Administrators often cancel (or reduce) staff for LCTL courses, pointing to low, decreasing or fluctuating enrollments. The faculty finds the situation uncertain and unpredictable, and students find that learning the language becomes disjointed or discontinuous. Many programs, due to weak continuing

23

support or fears of future enrollment declines, hire temporary native speakers for teachers. These teachers do not have the curricular or academic background required to support a small program, however. Without ongoing support and training, these hard-working teachers cannot maintain, much less expand, a healthy and full curriculum for the particular LCTL. Enrollments drop, and administrators have more justification to cut the program.

As with the MCTLs, but probably exacerbated by the relatively small size of the potential student population, the study of a LCTL is frequently subsidiary to other goals, such as reading literature. Language teachers (as opposed to professionals in other fields) are often regarded as 'mere' skill teachers, providing a service course, packing little intellectual vigor into their language courses. Indeed, some language teachers wait (patiently or otherwise) for the opportunity to move to literary courses, and an easier route to tenure.

The main concern is how we can get administrations to understand and validate the efforts and concerns of LCTL teachers. Several institutions (e.g., Stanford and Rice) have recently set up larger language centers, integrating all language departments under one umbrella. Each department maintains its own budget and language coordinators. All report to the language center's director. This center, then, cooperates and establishes links to other internationally-oriented campus units. Thus, language becomes an integral part of many diverse programs, not a mere add-on, and foreign languages (MCTLs and less commonly taught languages alike) gain a broad base of support on campus.

While structures of governance may often seem beyond the sphere of influence for LCTL teachers, bringing good, effective technology to LCTL students might be a more immediately attainable goal. Technology put to use in foreign language teaching, however, needs to be more than merely transferring workbook exercises to a new medium. Teachers and developers of technological products must understand the relationship of culture to language and language learning, and how students interact with language data they are in the process of learning. Clearly it is important to know what kind of language learning goes on for diverse students. For example, it is not sufficient to provide students an opportunity to have a keypal in a foreign language using e-mail on the Internet. We need to understand more of the learning process, and build in that understanding as LCTL programs integrate technology into the curriculum.

Technology can help LCTLs expand on the individualized kinds of learning that are more necessary for LCTLs. For example a student who knows Spanish and wants to learn Portuguese has significantly different needs from a fresh-start Portuguese student. The special needs of 'cross-

training' students should be encouraged with specifically designed courses or course supplements.

Sources of valuable information about integrating technology and language learning that LCTL teachers should be aware of include:

CALICO, Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium
<http://calico.org/about.html> and

IALL, International Association for Learning Laboratories
<http://eleazar.dartmouth.edu/IALL/>.

4.2 Summary of small group discussions

The discussions that took place in small groups, following Professor Garrett's talk, addressed both technology and institutional organization.

4.2.1 GOVERNANCE

No one model of interconnectivity among various languages and other disciplines can work for all situations in all institutions. It is important, for the sake of cooperation and setting common goals, to have institutionalized commonality. Larger administrative units might also prevent one program from becoming too dominant and powerful. A larger unit can share in the advocacy of language teaching in general and LCTL teaching specifically. For many of the least taught languages, their voices might be very hard to hear without joining with a larger unit.

One model discussed was that of separating out language teaching into a language teaching center. While this scheme has many advantages, it runs the risk of ghettoizing language instruction, falsely removing it from the other aspects of language learning. If such a unit were established, it is imperative that the members be granted the same tenure-track status and support for research and publishing that other faculty outside of this center receive. To fight against insularity and isolation in any department, faculty could be required (or at least encouraged) to be involved in inter-departmental teaching and interdisciplinary research. Faculty governance and recognition as a fully authorized academic unit are necessary.

4.2.2 TECHNOLOGY

Technology and pedagogy need to be coordinated and in balance, with good cooperation and communication between the developers and supporters of the products, and the instructors, who understand their curricula and their students. Optimally, it is sensible to have cooperation among several institutions, so that the newly produced materials are used in several places. Many institutions offer small grants for new material development, often

from 'teaching and learning' centers. These grants can be used in conjunction with outside funding sources.

It would be valuable to work against piecemeal adoption of technological tools. This encourages the 'flash in the pan' approach, which is haphazard and all too often disconnected from the curriculum. Faculty must also work against the administrative view that technology can help them cut costs in LCTL teaching, and both students and administrators must realize that technology is meant to be a complement to, not a substitute for good teaching. With more research into what works best for teaching under various conditions, and more training for teachers, it is also necessary to show the administration the real values of technological innovations. Hand in hand with this has to be the recognition of technological activities on the part of the administration in tenure and promotion decisions. Administrative mandates, money, and release time strengthen the faculty's drive and ability to work in newer technologies. Having an up-to-date teaching program with technologically sound components should serve as an attracting force for good teachers and students.

The technology gap, which leaves many LCTL teachers less well-prepared than they would like to be, could be partially remedied by creating language-specific clearinghouses for available resources, and by maintaining lists of frequently asked questions (FAQs). The International Association for Language Learning Technology [IALL] <http://starfire.dartmouth.edu/IALL/> and Language Learning Technology International [LLTI] listserv <http://polyglot.lss.wisc.edu/IALL/LLTI.html> should be consulted, as these two organizations already exist to serve the technological needs and interests of all language teachers.

However, self-reliance as it relates to materials development was also a concept mentioned several times. Teachers themselves need to become knowledgeable about the uses of technology. Towards this end, special technology workshops could be organized for specific less commonly taught languages or for LCTLs in general. In addition, technology training should be built into teacher training. Faculty should clearly articulate their goals for teaching, because only then will it become clearer how technology could help the overall plan and direction for the curriculum. A particularly perplexing situation with regard to technology involves a large group of LCTL teachers, namely transient and part-time instructors. Such colleagues may not come with well-developed skills for using the latest technology, and would not likely have time to develop such skills. Given the higher status accorded teachers of non-language classes (e.g., literature), many instructors do not see any value (either current or future) in learning to use appropriate technology. The idea of developing good material then becomes even less likely, due to the time commitment. On the other hand, it was pointed out that a thorough grounding in technological uses might make instructors more marketable, and emphasizing that such technological knowledge would give them an edge among the increasing numbers of non-permanent teaching staff in LCTL programs might encourage them to seek technology training.

To avoid the oft-cited complaint of duplication of efforts, a proposed solution would be to develop and use pedagogically sound templates and modules. The design for an effective program could be used and reused by several languages, by reconfiguring the specific language data while using the same basic structure. Several attempts at this kind of approach are underway, for example at CALL <http://www.call.gov/> and the University of Arizona's Computer Aided Language Instruction Group <http://cali.arizona.edu/>.

5. FINAL SESSION

During the final session at the 1996 LCTL summit, the floor was open for general comments and summaries. We began by posing the question, "Where do we go from here?" To answer this question, we need to look first at what has been done and then at what else there is to do. Two predominant questions raised were:

How do we use the existing resources?

How well are we prepared to adapt to new methods and resources?

All in attendance at the summit agreed that continued cooperation and communication are essential. LCTL teachers, as individuals and working within programs must look for ways to keep each other informed. Working in groups, not only for specific languages or language-groups, but also more generally as LCTL teachers who are facing many of the same issues can only serve to strengthen our efforts and increase the quality of the programs we teach in.

There was also general agreement that LCTL programs could benefit from more and better teacher training. How can these services be provided? Can the National Language Resource Centers contribute to this? How could that come about, given the present funding situations of the National Language Resource Centers? As it presently stands, the NLRCs are funded to carry out specific projects, and they cannot divert funds earmarked for one activity towards teacher training. In each funding cycle, the various NLRCs propose projects, and the whole package is accepted or rejected by the U.S. Department of Education. It might be possible to influence the re-authorization legislation at this point, requesting a special emphasis on teacher training. An alternate solution might be for teachers' organizations to sponsor training workshops and ask personnel from the National Language Resource Centers to conduct them, or to be active in planning them. An NLRC might try to organize teacher development workshops outside of their original funding, for example by seeking additional revenues, either locally or nationally.

The agenda for the future, and for future conferences conducted specifically for all-LCTL efforts, was discussed. All participants were determined that the discussions and communications begun at this summit meeting should continue in the future. Several participants offered to host and organize future summits. Some suggestions about the topics most in need of discussion: pedagogical research, how to fund it, and where to publish it.

These main issues were reiterated at the final session:

The issue of marketing and public perception was discussed throughout the summit, and was brought up again in this final session. We need to better understand the public's attitude about languages and language learning (especially LCTLs) and work to create a more positive disposition. The national organizations must take an active role here.

A high priority is the need to offer training for LCTL teachers and, perhaps less directly, train trainers who can then assist in teacher development. We need to discuss curriculum design, taking note of some of the findings about student motivation and newer technologies.

Our administrative programs need to validate what we do in the teaching of LCTLs. We must demonstrate the value of LCTLs and stress ties to global diversity, internationalism, and area studies. LCTL programs need to articulate our mission in a way that will keep us from being neglected, by both administrations and the public. While not ignoring the swell of interest in many LCTLs from heritage students, we need to be aware that our appeal should reach beyond heritage.

In addition to nationwide LCTL discussions like this summit and conferences sponsored by the national teachers' organizations, there is great value in organizing LCTL people at each institution. We should take this summit report and distribute it locally in order to encourage discussions of these same issues (most of which can only have local solutions) at each institution. The LCTL Project encourages teachers to ask about other LCTL teachers listed as teaching at local and regional institutions in our LCTL database.

Sharing of ideas and concerns needs go beyond the participants at this summit. All who attended this summit are encouraged to join LCTL-T, the listserv established by the LCTL project to help all LCTL teachers, regardless of which languages they teach. This listserv is a place to announce cooperative ventures, sharable material, and calls for papers and presentations. As a reminder, one can join LCTL-T by sending an e-mail message to:

listserv@tc.umn.edu

The body of the message is:

subscribe LCTL-T <first name> <last name>

as in the following example:

subscribe LCTL-T Jean Person

Recent postings from LCTL-T are available at:
<http://carla.acad.umn.edu/lctl/listservs.html>

The summit participants agreed that news from this summit and other LCTL news and information is best distributed through the LCTL-T listserv.

Sharing material and ideas is crucial. Moreover, we need to get recognition for our efforts to create and share material. LCTL programs need to make a recommendation to institutions to give recognition to those who create and share material.

Clarification on copyright issues is needed for many of our materials creation projects. Establishing a clearing house of non-published instructional materials could ease the burden of duplicating efforts. Given that copyright and ownership issues are complex and could not be resolved during the relatively short summit, perhaps the LCTL Project should undertake the establishment of a clearing house to investigate and disseminate this kind of information.

One participant reminded the group that the ERIC database and clearinghouse might be a good way to help publish papers dealing specifically with less commonly taught languages. ERIC is refereed and generally publishes material with a five month delay. It was suggested that perhaps we could piggyback on ERIC with a section for less commonly taught languages.

Participants discussed whether working within ACTFL as a special interest LCTL group was preferable to having an independent organization, which would mean having one more annual meeting to attend. The distinct sense of the participants was negative. ACTFL has shown little interest in many less commonly taught languages and for many teachers of the least commonly taught languages, there would be no real draw to their annual meetings.

There was a general reminder that the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages already exists. The Council will help specific LCTL groups become organized or improve their organization. The next LCTL conference will be hosted by NCOLCTL, at the University of Wisconsin—Madison. All participants enthusiastically supported continuing and expanding the discussions begun here.

6. APPENDIX I: Summit Announcement

LCTL Summit Meeting
September 20-21, 1996

The Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTL) Project at the University of Minnesota's Center for Advanced Research in Language Acquisition (CARLA) will sponsor a LCTL Summit meeting on September 20-21, 1996. This summit, held with the cooperation of the National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages (NCOLCTL), will build on the common interests and concerns of LCTL teachers in North America and will develop an action plan to help students, teachers, and programs teaching LCTLs.

The end result of the summit will be a plan for promotion of LCTL teaching and learning throughout North America, synthesizing the ideas which emerge from the meetings into a list of specific needs and realizable goals (e.g., production of materials templates, resource lists, plans for pedagogy instruction in LCTLs, ways to tap community resources, political strategies, etc.) to be undertaken by a consortium of interested organizations (including but not necessarily limited to the NLRCs and NRCs in Minnesota and elsewhere). This plan will serve as the basis for funding proposals to assist in carrying out the goals.

The summit will consist of three half-day sessions, each focusing on an important issue for LCTL teachers. A combination of whole-group and small-group discussions between LCTL teachers, administrators, and interested others will be used to brainstorm on specified topics and generate ideas for solutions to problems. The questions to be discussed include the following:

Session A. Promoting and protecting the LCTLs.

Enrollments

What is the current state of LCTL enrollments, are there noticeable trends, can we do anything to motivate more students to study LCTLs?

Communications

Are the current methods of communicating with other LCTL teachers and organizations adequate? If not, how can they be improved?

Session B. Pedagogy and Materials

Teacher Education

How are LCTL teachers prepared now? Are there better or different models that should be considered?

Materials availability

What can we do to fill the gap in pedagogical material effectively?

Session C. Delivery systems

Governance

How do different governance structures affect the teaching of LCTLs? Is there a way to influence the model if it seems another would work better?

Technology

Are LCTL teachers making the best use of technology to the benefit of their students?

Non-traditional class systems

How can we look beyond the traditional classroom setting to deliver sound LCTL instruction to a broad-based population?

7. APPENDIX II: Summit Application

please return by June 1, 1996

Less Commonly Taught Languages Summit
noon Friday, September 20 through evening Saturday, September 21, 1996.

Name

Address (the best place to send you mail)

CITY _____ STATE_____

phone (_____) _____ fax: (_____) _____

e-mail:

Department (if applicable) _____

Institution

LANGUAGES or LANGUAGE groups you represent:

Organization(s) that deal with LCTL teaching you are active in. Briefly describe your activities.

In which of the following broad topics do you feel you make the biggest contribution to the discussion at the Summit. Either select one or order them with 1 = biggest contribution.

___ LCTL enrollment issues

___ Communications among LCTL teachers

___ Teacher education

___ Materials availability

___ Governance

___ Technology and teaching

___ non Traditional class settings (including community and K-12)

In order to gather important information prior to the Summit, we plan to ask those we invite to the Summit to answer some questions about LCTLs and LCTL teaching. We will assemble the data and present summaries to all participants. Would you be willing to answer these questions and send us the data before August 15. We expect that it might take 2 or 3 hours to gather the information we request..

<yes> <no>?

LCTL Project
Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition
1313 5th St SE, Suite 111
Minneapolis MN 55414

lctl@tc.umn.edu;

✆612/627-1872, 612/627-1875 (fax)

8. Appendix III: Pre-Summit Survey

Twelve questions were sent out to participants. Summaries and analyses of the answers to these questions are presented below. These summaries are also available at <http://carla.acad.umn.edu/lctl/summit.html>. The analyses of questions 7-9 were prepared by Professor Hinnebusch for his talk on Materials during Session B.

8.1 *Is your general impression that enrollments for your language(s) (at your institutions) are increasing, decreasing or remaining about the same?*

Number of respondents: 40

Language	Institution	Enrollments
African lgs (Arabic, Hausa, Swahili)	Michigan State	Same
African lgs (Swahili, Zulu, Hausa)	UCLA	Same for last 10 yrs
African lgs (Swahili, Hausa)	U of Kansas	Increasing
Arabic	UW-Madison	Decreasing beyond 1st yr
Swahili	UW-Madison	Increasing
Hausa	UW-Madison	Same
Yoruba	UW-Madison	Increasing
Chinese	BYU-Hawaii	Same
Chinese	Hobart & Wm Smith	Increasing (1st yr), same at other levels
Chinese	U of Iowa	Increasing
Chinese	U of Maryland	Initial enrollments stable retention rates increasing
Chinese	UW-Madison	Slight increase
Czech	UW-Madison	Same
Danish	U of MN	Decreasing last 5 yrs
Dutch	IN U	Decreasing
Dutch	U of MI	Same
Dutch	UW-Madison	Increasing
Hawaiian	BYU-Hawaii	Slight increase

Hebrew	UW-Madison	Same (decrease in 1st yr, increase in advanced courses)
Hindi-Urdu	Columbia U	Same
Hindi	Duke U	Increasing
Hindi-Urdu	U of MI	Increasing
Hindi	U of PA	Same for last 2 yrs, after 5 yr increasing
Irish	UW-Madison (no official affiliation)	Increasing
Italian	Marlboro C	Slight decrease
Japanese	BYU-Hawaii	Same
Japanese	U of CO	Same
Japanese	U of Iowa	Slight increase
Japanese	UW-Madison	Slight decrease in 1st year, stable in upper levels
Japanese	UCSD	Decreasing
Japanese	Minneapolis Public Schools	Same
Maori	BYU-Hawaii	Same
Norwegian	U of MN	Decreasing
Persian	U of PA	Same
Persian	UT-Austin	Same
Polish	GW U	Same
Polish	UW-Madison	Slight increase
Portuguese	U of MN	Slight decrease
Russian	Brown U	Same after 5 yrs of decrease
Russian	GW U	Decreasing since 1990
Russian	UW-Madison	Decreasing
Russian	U of KY	Decreasing
Russian	Marlboro C	Decreasing
Samoan	BYU-Hawaii	Same
Serbian/Croatian	UW-Madison	Same
Swedish	U of MI	Decreasing last 3 yrs (1st yr)

Tagalog	U of HI	Large increase in 1993, same since then
Tongan	BYU-Hawaii	Same

* **Enrollment Note**: Two respondents supplied specific enrollment figures for courses and terms. Eleven others gave approximate numbers, or total numbers for all courses in a year. Most gave general impressions, and some said they would bring enrollment figures with them to the summit.

8.1.1 REASONS CITED FOR INCREASES IN ENROLLMENT:

(Increased publicity for the courses, including more advertising on campus and in the community, more recruiting by the instructors and more favorable word of mouth from former students.

(An increase in the number of heritage students for Hindi, Tagalog, and Persian, and for Yoruba, greater interest in African languages and cultures and an awareness of the importance of Yoruba heritage for African Americans.

(For Chinese, the development of a curricular track tailored to the needs of heritage students, as well as a mandatory placement test, are reasons given for the increased **retention** enrollment rates.

(For Chinese and Japanese, the increased potential for business opportunities in Asia.

(For Japanese, students who took it as a high school language course.

(For Hawaiian, the sovereignty issue has sparked increased interest in the language

(An overall increased awareness of LCTLs.

8.1.2 REASONS CITED FOR DECREASES IN ENROLLMENT:

- For Japanese, the economic decline of Japan.
- For Russian, enrollments have dropped 30-70% nationwide since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Students no longer think it is important or will "help" them get a job, many government agencies have stopped hiring Russian specialists, there has been a decline in the popularity of a Russian language/literature major.

- For others: a lack of publicity and awareness; lack of departmental support (including lack of up-to-date material and inconsistent teaching, and discouraging graduate students from taking the course for graduate credit); university policies which favor MCTLs, such as credit for high school work, and unlimited sections of MCTL classes.

8.1.3 SELF-STUDY OR INDEPENDENT STUDY PROGRAMS

Language	Institution	Enrollments
Micronesian lgs (Self-access instruction)	U of Oregon	Same or slightly increasing
Broad groups of LCTLs	Indianola, IA High School (independent study)	Increasing
Broad groups of LCTLs	SUNY Binghamton (Languages Across the Curriculum Program)	Decreasing
Broad groups of LCTLs	School for International Training (independent study)	Increasing

8.1.4 REASONS FOR INCREASES:

- More job opportunities (EFL instruction and business internships) are available. Also, the number of students increases as more resources/materials for study become available.
- At the high school level: students have already taken a MCTL, are interested in languages, want a challenge, like the opportunity to learn on their own.

8.1.5 REASONS FOR DECREASES:

- New York state policies on high school language requirements and secondary school availability have led to an increase in enrollments for Spanish and a corresponding decrease in LCTLs.

8.2 Why do students take courses in your language?

Number of respondents: 39

Heritage	26
Necessary or desirable for research or area of study	20
Opportunity for study/internship/job abroad	19
Interest in the culture (literature, music, dance, art, etc.).	18
Have traveled or plan to travel to country	13
Seemed challenging, exotic or "different	10
Personal relationship with native speaker (friend, spouse, in-law)	8
Fulfill a language requirement..	8
Easy way to fulfill language requirement	5
Good reputation/popular instructor.	3
Started in high school, want to continue	1
Parental decision (for high school students)	1
Because it's perceived as "cool" to do so (for high school students)	1

The most common response, across all languages, was **heritage**. This response included 1st or 2nd generation Americans who wanted to solidify ties to their culture and talk to parents and grandparents, and also those whose ancestry is more distant but who are interested in discovering more about their roots or ethnicity.

According to the respondents, those who find LCTL courses necessary or desirable (i.e., **immediately relevant**) for their studies include graduate students doing research in anthropology, art history, history, linguistics or literature, and undergraduate students in area studies, international relations, business or law, or those in a language/literature major in the language.

Others take courses because they see the language as **potentially relevant** for study abroad, or for jobs or internships in another country, or because they have a personal or romantic relationship with a (non-related) native speaker of the language.

A number of students become interested in a LCTL through interest in or experience with some aspect of the culture, such as martial arts or Japanese animation, Irish music and dance, films from Scandinavia or India, and literature and art from a number of cultures.

Travel to the country, whether completed or anticipated, is also a significant factor. This includes students who have returned from year-abroad programs and recreational travelers.

Some students take a LCTL because they are interested in languages and perceive the LCTLs as more challenging, exotic or "different" than languages they have taken before.

While some students cite "fulfilling a language requirement" as a motivation for taking a LCTL course, it is generally not the sole reason for doing so; for example, it fulfills a language requirement AND they are interested in the culture, or it fulfills a language requirement AND they view it as exotic or challenging, or it fulfills a language requirement AND it is part of their heritage. Those who take a LCTL because they think it will be an easy way to fulfill a language requirement are either 1st or 2nd generation Americans who already have some familiarity with the language, those who started the language in high school and want to continue, or those who already speak or have studied a closely related language.

In a few cases, an instructor's popularity, or a good reputation for teaching quality can spark interest in a LCTL. According to the two respondents who teach at the high school level, parents and peers are a significant influence on the decision to study a LCTL for high school students.

8.3 *Do you communicate regularly with other teachers in your language? With teachers of other Less Commonly Taught Languages? How?*

Number of respondents: 39

Communicate regularly, same language	yes: 34	no: 5
Communicate with other instructors of LCTLs.	yes: 29	no: 10

Means of Communication:

Professional conferences, workshops, seminars, etc.	26
Contact with colleagues in the same department or building	20
E-mail (both personal and discussion lists)	17
Personal communication (phone, mail, casual meetings)	13
Sitting in on courses from other LCTL teachers	1

Almost everyone who responded to this question said that they communicate regularly with other LCTL teachers. (3 of the people who responded 'NO' are directors of independent study programs, and do not actually teach, or even speak, the languages offered by the program).

Respondents said that they are more likely to communicate with other teachers of the same language or language group (for example, Scandinavian languages) than with teachers of other LCTLs. Furthermore, they are more likely to communicate more frequently and more informally with teachers of the same language, citing personal e-mail communication, phone calls or letters, informal lunches, etc., in addition to professional conferences. People who regularly communicate with teachers of other LCTLs do so because:

(they are in a department or building which houses several LCTLs and have an opportunity to chat with other teachers in the hallways or talk to them at department meetings

(they are involved in seminars and workshops for teachers at their own institution

(they attend conferences, seminars and workshops sponsored by ACTFL and NCOLCTL

(they belong to discussion lists on the Internet. (6 of the people who said they use e-mail specified discussion lists as well as personal communication)

8.4 How are LCTL teachers (at your institution or others you know about) prepared for language teaching?

Most of the participants in the survey did not know of any special training or preparation for LCTL teachers at their institution or elsewhere. For this reason, and because the training programs which were described are quite varied, the individual responses have been compiled and summarized by institution.

New faculty and lecturers at Brown University are encouraged to take part in year-long workshops offered by the university's Center for the Advancement of College Teaching. Brown also has an interdepartmentally-sponsored course in language teaching methods that is open to graduate students and advanced undergraduates; students in Italian, French and Spanish are required to take it; both the German and Slavic departments don't allow their students to take the course until they have fulfilled other Ph.D. course requirements, which effectively means they can't take it until after their time as instructors is past. This year, however, the German and Slavic departments are cooperating in offering an expanded pre-service workshop.

The World Languages coordinator at BYU-Hawaii offers a yearly in-service training meeting for language teachers; bi-monthly visits are made by the coordinator with follow-up interview/critique sessions with each teacher.

At UCLA, African language TAs have to take a TA training course, and if they are not already trained or experienced language teachers, they work under the supervision of a professor for one year. This supervision usually involves team-teaching with the professor for at least one quarter; in subsequent quarters their teaching is closely monitored through visits to the classroom and frequent meetings. The TAs are also required to attend annual workshops and meetings held at UCLA that deal with a range of language-teaching issues, mainly focusing on teaching methodology.

Assistant instructors of Dutch at Indiana University are required to take a class on teaching methods, and are observed by department faculty and evaluated by them annually.

The Department of Asian Languages and Literatures at the University of Iowa has a MA degree program in Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language. Students in the program are trained in Chinese language, Chinese linguistics, Chinese culture and literature and Chinese language pedagogy, which includes:

> background of and assumptions about the Chinese language, such as the writing system, romanization, languages/dialects of Chinese and communicative protocols in Chinese; Chinese pedagogical

assumptions; curriculum design (goals); classroom management; lesson planning; resources/materials use; methodology (communication approaches); learning strategies; assessment and evaluation (standards); articulation; performed culture; program development (management, alternative instruction, community support); material development and technology; advanced skills (narrative, rhetoric, composition and achievement culture/literature); integration of theory and research in CFL and classroom instruction; and the cognitive basis of CFL.

Students who have graduated from the program are either teaching at the college/university level as instructors or are pursuing an advanced degree in applied linguistics/foreign language education (at Iowa or at other universities).

The U of Iowa also has certification programs for Chinese and Japanese Secondary Instruction in the College of Education. There is regular communication between these program and the programs in the Department of Asian Languages and Literatures, and two of the courses in the program for the MA in TCFL are also required courses for the Chinese certification program. Non-native speakers of Japanese must complete at least four years of Japanese language instruction to be certified in the state of Iowa, and native speakers must pass the university's SPEAK/LECT test to become a TA.

The Department of African and African-American Studies at the University of Kansas holds a pedagogical orientation for TAs at the beginning of the school year, and the TAs are closely monitored and observed and provided with feedback on how to improve their teaching.

In the Department of Slavic Languages, the extent of departmental training for TAs ranges from several individual consultations with the department's language coordinator, to participation in a pre-service workshop and weekly consultation meetings, to participation in the workshop, weekly consultation, and enrollment in a semester-long three-credit course in the teaching of Slavic languages. Additionally, all TAs are encouraged to observe each other's classes as well as to share their own teaching activities. At least once a semester, the language coordinator observes classes taught by the TAs and holds follow-up conferences. The University of Kansas also has a Russian and East European Studies National Resource Center, which hosts an annual one-day pedagogy workshop.

At the University of Maryland, LCTL teachers have limited preparatory workshops prior to the beginning of the academic year.

Teachers of Scandinavian languages at the *University of Minnesota* have an annual week-long orientation, quarterly workshops, and a course for new teachers.

At the University of Pennsylvania, all new language teachers, including LCTL teachers, must participate in two major workshops: a week long workshop that prepares teachers for communicative teaching, and an OPI workshop to prepare teachers for proficiency testing. In addition, there are ongoing language-specific and general meetings for the professional development of all language teachers.

The University of Colorado as a secondary certification program jointly directed by the College of Education and the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures, which is a one-year post-BA program of coursework and practicum.

Assistant instructors and TAs in Middle Eastern Languages and Cultures at The University of Texas at Austin take a teacher-training course taught by an expert in applied linguistics.

At the *University of Wisconsin*, there is a general foreign language TA orientation program for all foreign language TAs. In addition, there is a methods course for Russian TAs and faculty supervision is provided. A course in "Methods of Teaching African Languages" will be offered for the first time in the Fall 1996 term by the Department of African Languages and Literatures. Japanese students also take a one-semester course in Japanese language acquisition, and usually have one year's experience as a teaching assistant. Some students also take other advanced language acquisition courses (mostly research oriented) offered in other departments. In some departments, LCTLs have faculty coordinators who guide the TAs; in other departments faculty will supervise one or two TAs.

8.5 Did you receive any formal or specialized teacher training for language teaching in general or for teaching your particular language (s)?

Number of respondents: 41

No training	8
Degree in foreign or 2nd language education specific to a particular LCTL	3
Degree in foreign or second language education not specific to particular LCTL.	4
Degree in applied linguistics	1
Degree in linguistics	5
Degree in TESOL	4
Degree in language/literature.	2
Received training as a graduate student through:	
• TA orientation workshops	4
• Formal supervision from faculty.	4
• Informal supervision/mentoring	1
Took courses in education, language pedagogy, applied linguistics, or language acquisition	10
Had other formal teacher training (e.g., Peace Corps)	2
Have attended ACTFL workshops	6
Have attended workshops at other conferences, summer programs, etc.	7
Conduct teacher training for others	2
Keep up through journals, self-study in language acquisition theory, language pedagogy	3

8.6 Do you know of training for teachers of French, German and Spanish? If so, do you think LCTL teachers could benefit from similar education?

Twelve survey participants either didn't answer this question, or said they didn't know of training for teachers of French, German or Spanish, although a few of these said that LCTL teachers could benefit from similar training, whatever it may be (i.e., that some training in language teaching would be better than **no** training in language teaching).

Many of the respondents to this question saw advantages to teacher training that is the same as or similar to that conducted for teachers of French, German and Spanish (CTLs). As one participant observed, it is no secret that being a great native speaker does not guarantee that one is a great teacher.

Respondents suggested that **any** training in language pedagogy is better than no training, and that good, general university courses that offer an overview of teaching methodologies and SLA theory should apply to the teaching of any language. Workshops, such as those offered by ACTFL and the regional and state foreign language organizations, are also useful, as are summer institutes like the CORLAC Summer Institute at Bryn Mawr, staffed by many successful language teachers. A teacher with an open, creative mind can gather ideas from any of these that can be adapted to his/her own language.

Survey participants noted that CTL teachers often take part in teaching and testing workshops; LCTL teachers would benefit from similar workshops which would raise their awareness about important issues of learning, teaching and testing. This would be especially helpful, according to one respondent, because, "...despite pedagogical methods training, there is a great tendency to trod serially lock-step through the available text because that is the easiest thing to do, especially if you have another full-time job and little time to prepare for the language teaching assignment..."

One respondent felt that attending CTL training could be beneficial because it would allow one to receive an introduction to the most up-to-date methods and theories, learn about technology, and become familiar with the newest textbooks in the "major languages" so one sees how new teaching methods are applied in practice and how they could be adjusted to the LCTL. Another felt that even if LCTL teachers cannot apply every technique from such training, collaboration with other teachers can stimulate creativity, and collaborative action research is needed to test which strategies work under which situations.

Another respondent pointed out that at many institutions, graduate students in French, German and Spanish can choose a program track in SLA, and suggested that LCTLs at those institutions could also give their students the opportunity to choose the SLA track apart from the Linguistics/Literature tracks. (The respondent is introducing this opportunity for African languages at UW-Madison.)

Some survey participants were more cautioning in their response to this question. They said that, while courses like classroom management, SLA, etc. can be shared, and other courses aimed at teachers of the CTLs can be beneficial, LCTL teachers must have enough of their own training to be cognizant of the fact that they cannot simply apply techniques learned from CTL teacher training to their own classrooms. Several people noted that the problems and goals in LCTL teaching are quite different, and that the significant linguistic/cultural differences between French, German and Spanish and most LCTLs require significant modifications to theories/models/paradigms. According to one, "... The issue of language learning is not strictly one of methodology, but of programming which seeks

to incorporate a larger set of questions from user needs, goal clarification, program design and evaluation, etc..."

A couple of people also noted the problem of feasibility for LCTL teacher training at specific institutions, arguing that French, German and Spanish require enough teachers to justify resources for materials and programs for teacher training, but that there are few programs of equal breadth and depth for LCTLs. Others, however, have already suggested solutions. Rifkin (1992), for example, discusses how to do teacher training and education specifically for LCTLs such as Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Russian. One survey participant proposes an annual teacher preparation conference for LCTL teachers

Another respondent suggests that LCTL teachers would best be served by developing a core of "master teacher-trainers" that could work throughout the US to train other teachers, rather than focusing teacher training for a specific institution.

References

Rifkin, B. (1992). "Breaking out of the vicious circle: Teacher training, education and supervision for the Less Commonly Taught Languages." In Walz, J. (ed.), *Development and Supervision of Teaching Assistants in Foreign Languages.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle (pp. 47-84).
[Refers to the teaching of Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Russian, among other languages.]

8.7 *Do you use a textbook?*

Number of respondents: 40

The languages represented are listed below along with a number in parentheses. This indicates the number of respondents who are engaged with a particular language. List of Languages (parentheses indicate number of times a language is mentioned for which a text is being used; the total exceed the number of respondents presumably because some of us are involved in teaching more than one LCTL).

Arabic (3)
Chinese (3)
Danish (1)
Dutch (3)
Hausa (4)
Hawaiian (1)
Hebrew (1)
Hindi (4)
Hindi-Urdu (1)
Irish (2)
Japanese (10)
Latin (1)
Maori (1)
*Micronesian (1)
Norwegian (1)
Persian (2)
Polish (1)
Portuguese (1)
Russian (4)
Samoan (1)
Slavic lgs (?) (1)
Swahili (4)
Swedish (1)
Yoruba (2)
Tagalog (1)
Tongan (1)
*Zulu (1)

*Text not used. Also 1 Japanese respondent is not using a text

8.8 *What kinds of other curricular material do you use on a regular basis?*

Number of respondents: 38

Responses are organized in descending order with the most used sorts of materials listed first; the numbers in each numbered line indicate the number of respondents who make use of the listed curricular materials:

	#	type of material
1.	27	Other video (films, television programs, videotapes)
2.	15	Other audio tapes (music, radio programs, listening comprehension exercises)
3.	14	Authentic broadcast or print material (newspapers, magazines, ads, broadcast news)
4.	10	Realia: (maps, menus, visa forms, phone books, tickets, programs/schedules, etc.)
5.	10	Literature: children's books, poetry, prose, folk tales

6.	7	Photographs/Slides/Pictures/Transparencies
7.	7	Handouts created by the instructor
8.	7	Materials on the Internet (e-mail, Web, etc.)
9.	6	Songs and music
10.	5	Video tapes accompanying textbook or video lessons
11.	5	Lessons, exercises, etc. from supplementary texts
12.	4	Audio tapes accompanying textbook or audio lessons
13.	4	CD-ROM
14.	4	Computer-based exercises, writing tools, or other software.
15.	3	Workbooks

Other unquantified responses: Foods, odors, games using the target language, interviews with native speakers, in-class guest speakers.

8.9 What kinds of curricular material would you like to use, if they were easily available?

Number of respondents 38:

Responses are organized in the chart in descending order with most frequently cited items listed first.

1.	9	Interactive/technology-oriented material (unspecified)
2.	9	Video: pedagogically sound lessons and video tapes
3.	7	Internet: Web materials
4.	7	Video: entertainment programs in the target language/culture
5.	6	CD-ROM texts and materials
6.	5	Textbooks, dictionaries, reference grammars, workbooks
7.	4	Multi-media teaching materials (software, texts)
	4	Already have enough (Japanese, Chinese, Swedish, Persian)
9.	3	Computer-Assisted Instructional materials
10.	2	Internet: e-mail (between students and between students & teacher)
11.	2	Internet: discussion lists
12.	2	Video: SCOLA transmissions
13.	2	Audio: additional authentic recordings
14.	2	Realia
15.	1	Laser disc

8.10 Describe the governance / administrative organization (or structure) in your situation, for example: language and literature courses in one unit; separate language unit; share budget with other LCTLs, more commonly taught languages; area studies; independent study.

Number of respondents: 42

Language and Literature together in one unit.	34
Separate language unit.	1 (secondary school)

(The rest did not specify)

Administration/Funding (more than one response was given for some)

Single language department.	1
Share budget with other LCTLs	23
Share budget with CTLs	11
Share budget with area studies	6
Partial funding from grants or endowments.	5
Independent study.	5
Program for gifted and talented students (secondary school).	1
Share budget with linguistics	1

Among the respondents, the following descriptions were given not fitting the administrative organizations summarized above were also given.

Irish classes in Madison, Wisconsin are taught by someone with a University of Wisconsin affiliation, but the language instruction is not administered or funded through the University. Classroom space is provided through the generosity of the Department of History. At Marlboro College, all foreign language instruction is housed in one unit, but all college faculty in all disciplines have an equal say in administrative/budget affairs, so there is no structure per se. At UCSD, undergraduate-level Japanese and Chinese belong to the History Department, and undergraduate-level Korean and Vietnamese belong to the Graduate School of International Relations. However, all undergraduate-level language instruction is under the Dean of Humanities, who controls the budget for all language instruction.

8.11 What kinds of technology help you in your teaching? What other kinds of technology would help you?

Number of respondents: 44

8.11.1 TECHNOLOGY - CURRENTLY USED:

VCR/Videotape/Film	29
Audio lab/cassette recorder/tapes/CDs	24
Computer (general)	11
Word-processing software/dictionaries	7
Internet listservs, e-mail	6
Overhead projector	5
World Wide Web	4
CD-ROM supplementary materials	4
Tools for developing CALL/self-study materials	2
Satellite broadcasts	2

Other: Laser disc, LAN-based authentic reading materials, slide projector, photocopier, color printer

8.11.2 TECHNOLOGY - WOULD LIKE TO USE

Self-paced computer-based learning aids	7
World Wide Web (better access, more materials	7
Internet/e-mail (access, fonts for non-Roman writing systems	6
CD-ROM exercises and materials	6
Video/video-based exercises	5
Interactive software course materials and tools to develop them	5
Multimedia lessons to supplement basic materials	3
Video discs	3
Video camera	2

Other: TV-VCR, texts with hypertext annotations and tools to develop them, cable television, a scanner with scanning software for non-Roman writing systems, **classroom** access to multimedia (not just in a language lab).

Not everyone who responded to this question gave separate answers to the two parts, so when only one answer or answer list was given, it was included in the count for "Technology - Currently Used". Furthermore,

respondents did not usually distinguish between tools they use to prepare for class, and tools they use in teaching class, or have their students use in class, so although some **did** distinguish, all responses were compiled together for this summary. Several respondents noted that, while they would like to have additional technological tools, they did not think additional technology was necessary for being an effective teacher; in fact, one person felt that much of the "high technology" for language instruction was more effective for large numbers of students. As LCTL classes are often smaller and allow for more personal interaction between the students and the instructor, teachers should cultivate the interaction and not rely too much on the technology.

8.12 Please describe your teaching situation if it involves audiences other than traditional secondary or post-secondary students (e.g., community education, heritage classes, church-related classes, correspondence courses, distance education)

Number of respondents: 43

The majority of people (26) responding to this question teach only regular high school or college language courses. Some noted, however, that some of the students enrolled in their regular classes are older than average or younger than average (i.e., high school students enrolled in college courses); most of these are people from the community who have a heritage interest in the language. Three others mentioned that they teach college language courses for special purposes, such as business or technical language. One of the high school teachers who participated in the survey supervises independent study courses for high school students, many of whom are "at risk."

Two survey participants who are Chinese teachers said that they have instituted, as a regular part of their language curricula, courses or course tracks specially tailored to heritage students. These students often have high oral/aural proficiency (sometimes in non-Mandarin dialects) but no functional written language proficiency, and after taking these courses students are ready for integration into the more advanced (traditional) courses.

8.12.1 OTHER TYPES OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN WHICH SURVEY PARTICIPANTS ARE INVOLVED INCLUDE:

- Involvement with a correspondence course in Hebrew through University extension.
- Teaching Urdu on a voluntary basis to high-school students.
- Private tutoring in Swedish to older people with Swedish background and family.

- Designing, organizing and teaching "non-academic" Persian courses for business people, government linguists and university students who want to improve their skills (e.g., an intensive, 5-week summer course in intermediate Persian).
- Occasional community education classes in Dutch
- Supervising "on-demand" supervised tutorials in African languages
- Organizing after school/summer programs for elementary, middle and high school students in Swahili, and training teachers of Swahili for summer programs at neighborhood houses.
- Teaching Arabic at a NEH Institute on "Islam in West Africa" in Arkansas.
- The self-access materials for Micronesian languages developed at the University of Oregon are available to anyone who requests them.
- At the University of Wisconsin, almost all Irish students are from the community and are 30-40 years of age. In fact, traditional students often sign up for the class but then drop out when their "real classes" get too demanding.
- Temple University works with heritage learners of Greek in conjunction with the Hellenic School of the Greek Orthodox Cathedral.

8.12.2 FUTURE PLANS FOR OTHER (NON-TRADITIONAL) INVOLVEMENT:

- Distance education for Yoruba is anticipated upon the completion of a CD-ROM text.
- Offering distance education in Japanese at the advanced level to supplement elementary and intermediate courses offered at other state institutions and to make specially-tailored courses available to the community.

9. Appendix IV: Roster of Participants

Susham Bedi, Department of Middle East Languages and Cultures, Columbia University
Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi

Katia Bezerra, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Portuguese

Antonius Broos, Department of Germanic Languages, University of Michigan
Dutch

Yu-Shih Chen, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Chinese

Kathy Christoph, Learning Technology and Distance Education, University of Wisconsin—Madison
Directs a group that supports faculty in the effective integration of technology into teaching and learning across all disciplines.

Lynda Clarke, Asian & Middle East Studies, University of Pennsylvania
Persian, Arabic

William J. Comer, Department of Slavic Languages, University of Kansas
Russian at all levels; also responsible for the coordination and teacher/teaching assistant development/ training in Polish, Croatian/Serbian and Ukrainian.

Carol J. Compton, Center for SE Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Lao, Thai

Lynne deBenedette, Department of Slavic Languages, Brown University
Russian

David J. Dwyer, Department of Anthropology, Michigan State University
The Mande languages and the Pidgin/Creole languages of West Africa, though as Language Coordinator of the African Language Program at Michigan State University, supervise tutorials for a variety of African languages, including most commonly, Bambara, Fulfulde, Wolof and Shona.

CO

Michael E. Everson, Foreign Language Education, University of Iowa
Chinese (Interested also in Japanese)
Iowa Critical Languages Program Foreign Language Education in general with specialty in LCTLs

Beatriz C .Fantini, Language and Culture Center, School for International Training
Teach: Spanish; Coordinate/Supervise independent study in several languages: Portuguese, Italian, Arabic, Hungarian, Thai, Korean, Japanese, Tibetan, Twi, Khmer, Greek, Ndebele, Vietnamese

Vijay Gambhir, South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania
As a methodologist, I work with a variety of LCTL teachers and coordinators, e.g., Persian, Turkish, Irish, Swahili, Czech, and Hungarian

Nina Garrett, CTW Mellon Project for Language Pedagogy and Multimedia Technology, Wesleyan University
all (LCTL project national advisor)

Dineen Grow, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin — Madison
Irish

T. Edward Harvey, World Languages, Brigham Young University—Hawai'i Campus
Austronesian—Hawai`ian; Maori; Samoan; Tongan; & Japanese; and Mandarin.

Kazumi Hatasa, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Purdue University
Japanese

Yukiko Abe Hatasa, Asian Languages and Literature, University of Iowa
Japanese

Peter Hendriks, East Asian Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin-Madison
teach Japanese (also represent Chinese and Korean)

Michael Craig Hillmann, Department of Middle Eastern Languages and Cultures, University of Texas at Austin
Persian; languages taught in Department: Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and Turkish

Thomas Hinnebusch, Department of Linguistics and UCLA Language Material Project, University of California — Los Angeles
Swahili and other Bantu languages

Richard House, Foreign Languages, Marlboro College
Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Polish, Japanese, Turkish, Norwegian

Robert B. Howell, Department of German (Dutch section), University of Wisconsin — Madison
Dutch

Gabriela Ilieva, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Hindi

Louis Janus, LCTL Project, CARLA, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities.
Norwegian

Karen Møller Irving, Department of Scandinavian, University of California — Berkeley
Scandinavian

Gary Jahn, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Russian

Chuanren Ke, Department of Asian Languages & Literature, The University of Iowa
Chinese

Sydney Kinnaman, American English Institute/Center for Asian Pacific Studies, University of Oregon
Pacific Islands Languages-Micronesia (Currently: Pohnpeian, Kosraean, Yapese)

Patricia S. Kuntz, American Institute for Yemeni Studies, University of Wisconsin
African languages: Ancient Egyptian, Arabic, Swahili, (Twi), (Yoruba

Yasumi Kuriya, Asian Languages and Literature, University of Iowa
Japanese

C2

Karen Lybeck, Linguistics/Scandinavian/CLA Language Center, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Scandinavian (Norwegian)

Fiona Mc Laughlin, Department of Linguistics — African Studies, University of Kansas
African: Swahili, Hausa, Wolof. I am coordinator of African Languages.

Scott McGinnis, Asian and East European Languages and Cultures, University of Maryland
Chinese

John B. Means, Critical Languages Center, Temple University
Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, Korean, Greek, Portuguese (through Critical Languages Programs)

Gilead Morahg, Department of Hebrew Studies, U of Wisconsin — Madison
Hebrew

Lioba Moshi, African Languages Program, Comparative Literature Department, University of Georgia
African languages, Swahili and Yoruba

Barbara Mozdzierz, Department of German and Slavic Languages and Literatures, George Washington University
Russian and Polish

Ann Mulkern, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Irish

Glenn Nordin, DCI, Foreign Language Committee
LCTLs in general, intelligence and national foreign language learning policy

Lotta Olvegård, Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan
Swedish

Jonathan Paradise, Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Hebrew

James Parente, Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Scandinavian and Dutch

Thomas Petersson, Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Danish

Leonard Polakiewicz, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Polish

Ellen Rafferty, Department South Asian Studies, U. Wisconsin-Madison
Indonesian, Malay

Teresita V. Ramos, Department of Hawaiian and Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures, University of Hawaii — Manoa
Tagalog (Filipino) and major SEA languages

Laurel Rasplica Rodd, East Asian Languages and Literatures, University of Colorado
Japanese

Jeanmarie Rouhier-Willoughby, Russian and Eastern Studies, University of Kentucky
Russian; Slavic in general

Nicolaas A. Van Der Sanden, Department of German, Scandinavian and Dutch, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Dutch

Antonia Y. Folarin Schleicher, Department of African Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin — Madison
African Languages (Yoruba)

Dick Schmidt, National Foreign Language Resource Center, University of Hawaii — Manoa
NFLRC representative

Leslie Schrier, Foreign Language Education, University of Iowa
Teacher education, Iowa Critical Languages Education

C 1

Gautami Shah, Asian and African Languages and Literature, Duke University
Hindi

Tahsin Siddiqi, Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Michigan
Hindi-Urdu, Indo-Aryan Languages

Nancy Stenson, Institute of Linguistics and Asian and Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Minnesota—Twin Cities
Irish

H. Stephen Straight, Department of Anthropology, Program in Linguistics, Languages Across the Curriculum (LxC), Binghamton University (SUNY)
*languages or language groups I represent/teach: languages studied personally (asterisk marks language taught) French, German, Japanese, *Yucatec Maya, Spanish, Romanian; languages included to date in Binghamton's LxC program: Chinese, ESL, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Spanish; languages that could eventually be included in SUNY's multi-campus LxC Select consortium via distance-learning technology: unlimited*

Jolanda Vanderwal Taylor, Department of German, University of Wisconsin —Madison
Dutch, German

Patricia M. Thornton, Anthony School, Minneapolis Public Schools
Japanese

Nhlanhla Thwala, African Studies Program, Indiana University
Zulu

Jan Tinder, Gifted Ed/Independent Study, Indianola High School
I offer American Sign Language, Arabic, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Esperanto, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Polish, Portuguese, Serbo-Croatian, Russian, Swedish, and am collecting materials for others. I am not fluent in all of these but supervise the self-study courses.

Yashy Tohsaku, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies/ Programs in Japanese Studies/Korea-Pacific Program/ Vietnam-Pacific Program, University of California, San Diego (UCSD)
Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, and some Southeast Asian languages (Bahasa Indonesia, Tagalog, Cambodian, and Thai); Director, Undergraduate Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese programs; Director, Graduate Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese programs; Teaching advanced-level Japanese and technical Japanese courses

Inge Van der Cruysse, Department of Germanic Studies, Indiana University Bloomington
Dutch

CENTER FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH
ON LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Institute of International Studies and Programs

Suite 111, UTEC, 1313 5th Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55414
Telephone: (612) 627-1870
Fax: (612) 627-1875
E-mail: carla@tc.umn.edu
Web: http://carla.acad.umn.edu